

REMARKS

Claims 2-13, 15-16 and 18-28 are pending. By this Amendment, independent claims 19 and 20 are amended to even more clearly distinguish from the cited references and to overcome the Office Action's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and claim 23 is amended to correct an obvious error. Support for the amendments to independent claims 19 and 20 can be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at page 13, line 23 - page 14, lines 22. No new matter is added by the amendments.

Claims 2-13, 15-16 and 18-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite and as allegedly being incomplete in five separate rejections. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to overcome the rejections. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Claims 2-4, 15-16, 19-20, 24 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0219127) in view of Saito (U.S. Patent No. 7,093,295) and in view of Chiarabini (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0015687). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Russ in view of Saito and Chiarabini fails to disclose or render obvious the combinations of features recited in amended independent claims 19 and 20. Russ, Saito and Chiarabini fail to disclose or render obvious the features "the deciding device decides that the decrypted data decrypted by the decryption module is either to be printed without the encryption module encrypting the decrypted data, or to be stored in the storage device, based on a job classification information of the decrypted data" and " the deciding device decides that the decrypted data decrypted by the decryption module is to be stored in the storage device either with or without the encryption module encrypting the decrypted data when the deciding device decides that the decrypted data is to be stored in the storage device, based on a storage time and a confidentiality of the decrypted data" as recited in claim 19 and similarly

recited in claim 20. Chiarabini only discloses printing input data in the encrypted form that needs to be decrypted. See paragraph [0007], paragraph [0080] and Fig. 8. Chiarabini explicitly teaches only using the data in an encrypted format to avoid data compromise and to prevent humans in the print service provider facility from making electronic copies. See paragraph [0080]. Chiarabini always use encrypted data and does not base decisions to store the data on "a storage time and a confidentiality of the decrypted data." Thus, Russ when modified by Saito and Chiarabini fails to disclose or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 19 and 20, of " the deciding device decides that the decrypted data decrypted by the decryption module is either to be printed without the encryption module encrypting the decrypted data, or to be stored in the storage device, based on a job classification information of the decrypted data" and "the deciding device decides that the decrypted data decrypted by the decryption module is to be stored in the storage device either with or without the encryption module encrypting the decrypted data when the deciding device decides that the decrypted data is to be stored in the storage device, based on a storage time and a confidentiality of the decrypted data". Claims 2-4, 15-16, 24 and 26-27 are patentable for at least the reasons recited with respect to independent claims 19 and 20. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 5-13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of Saito and in view of Chiarabini and further in view of Blakley III (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,952). Blakley III fails to overcome the deficiencies in Russ, Saito and Chiarabini. Claims 5-13 and 18 are dependent from claims 19 and 20 and accordingly, are patentable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 19 and 20. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 21-23, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Russ in view of Saito in view of Chiarabini and further in view of Foster (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184518). Foster fails to overcome the deficiencies in the references applied

against independent claims 19 and 20. Claims 21-23, 25 and 28 are dependent from claims 19 and 20. Accordingly, claims 21-23, 25 and 28 are patentable for at least the reasons recited above with respect to claims 19 and 20. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert G. Bachner
Registration No. 60,122

JAO:RGB/jls

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 26, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--